



Clean Water Management Trust Fund Restoration Application Rating System

General Statute 143B-135(b) states that the fund shall may develop guidelines in addition to the minimum criteria for awarding grants. To assist with the allocation of grant funds, the following rating system was approved by the full CWMTF Board at their meeting on February 10, 2014, revised June 5, 2018.

Rating Overview – The major components of the rating system and percentages are listed below:

Section I. Resource Significance (15%)

- A. Primary Resource Benefits

Section II. Effectiveness/Measurable Outcomes (45%)

- A. Effectiveness of Project
- B. Consistency with DWR Basinwide Plan, NC Division of Mitigation Services (formerly EEP), CWMTF, other Surface Water Agency plans
- C. Innovative Procedures or Technologies

Section III. Other Public Benefits (10%)

- A. Recreational Uses and Public Access
- B. Provides Public or Scientific Education
- C. Development of Riparian Greenways
- D. Location Relative to Existing and Future Public Drinking Water Supply

Section IV. Readiness (10%)

- A. Landowner Interest
- B. Funding Status
- C. Plan and Design Status

Section V. Value (20%)

- A. Matching Resources

(Rating System Details below)

Section I. Resource Significance (0-15 points)

A. Primary Resource Benefits (Max 15 points)

Points in this subsection will be awarded based on the highest level for which the project qualifies.

15 Points

Outstanding Resource Waters classification
Impaired waters identified by the Division of Water Resources and on the 303(d) list
Classified shellfishing SA approved for harvest by the Division of Environmental Health

13 Points

High Quality Waters classification – does not include HQW “by definition” such as WSI, II or SA waters
Wild trout as designated by the Wildlife Resources Commission
Excellent bioclassification as determined by the Division of Water Resources
Water Supply I classification
Water Supply II classification
Water Supply Critical Area classification
Future surface water supply that has received Record of Decision within 5 miles downstream

11 Points

Classified shellfishing SA conditionally approved for harvest by the Division of Environmental Health
Streams supporting species listed as Federally Threatened or Endangered
Water Supply III classification
Water Supply IV classification
Primary Nursery Areas identified by the Division of Marine Fisheries
Inland Primary Nursery Areas identified by the Wildlife Resources Commission
Future surface drinking water supply intake or reservoir within 5 miles downstream has
Division of Water Resources concurrence

9 Points

Division of Coastal Management exceptional wetland
Division of Water Resources unique wetland
Nutrient Sensitive Waters classification
Water Supply V classification
Surface Drinking Water Susceptibility Rating of “Higher”

7 Points

B stream classification
Surface Drinking Water Susceptibility Rating of “Moderate”
National Scenic Waters, National Heritage River or National Seashore.
National or State Park, National Wildlife Refuge or Coastal Preserve

5 Points

Good bioclassification as determined by the Division of Water Resources
Trout classification

3 Points

Other SA (not approved or conditionally approved for harvest)
Surface Drinking Water Susceptibility Rating of “Lower”

Section II. Effectiveness/Measurable Outcomes (0-45 points)

A. Effectiveness of Project (Max. 38 points)

1. Functional uplift of stream/catchment *[relative to problems identified; uplift = improving hydrology, water quality, and/or habitat; based on restoring maximum remaining functional potential]* (Max. 10 points)
 - a. The majority of the linear feet (LF) of stream work qualifies as stream restoration and the current condition of the stream geomorphology and hydraulics is,
 - i) Severely degraded or threatened with imminent degradation. (10 points)
 - ii) Moderately degraded. (6 points)
 - b. The majority of the LF of stream work qualifies as Enhancement and the current water quality or ecological function is,
 - i) Severely degraded or threatened with imminent degradation. (7 points)
 - ii) Moderately degraded (4 points)
 - c. The majority of the LF of stream work qualifies as Enhancement Level II Streambank Stabilization and the riparian zone condition is;
 - i) Severely degraded. (5 points)
 - ii) Moderately degraded. (3 points)
 - d. The project area is generally stable and not clearly threatened by degradation (0 points)
2. Proximity of restoration stream reach to other restored reaches or land conservation in the same stream system (Max. 5 points)
 - a. Project is <1 mile from one of these (5 points)
 - b. Project is 1 mile or up to 3 miles from one of these (3 points)
 - c. Project is more than 3 miles and up to 4 miles from one of these (2 points)
 - d. Project is more than 4 miles or up to 5 miles from one of these (1 point)
 - e. Project is >5 miles from one of these (0 points)
3. Local water quality protection currently in effect in the project's watershed. (Max. 3 points)
 - a. Local protection includes stormwater management program, ordinances, and/or planning; **and** local buffer, wetland and/or floodplain protection ordinances. (3 points)
 - b. Local protection includes **either** stormwater management program, ordinances, and/or planning; **or** local buffer, wetland and/or floodplain protection ordinances. (2 points)
 - c. No protection ordinances are in place (0 points)
4. Watershed stability (2 points) *[rate of land-use change in the project watershed over the next 20 years]:*
 - Little or no change expected because the area is currently rural or protected and not likely to develop; or already fully developed as urban/suburban.

[Section II continued below]

5. Cost per unit [in design\$ or construction\$ per LF restored]. If scope is design only, use sum of total costs for design and permitting. If scope is construction only, use sum of total costs for construction, construction contingency, and construction admin/observation. If scope is design and construction, use same as for construction only. (Max. 10 points) **See table below.**

<u>COST PER UNIT (\$/lf)</u>		
<u>Score</u>	<u>Design¹</u>	<u>Construction²</u>
10	<20	<75
9	20-29	75-109
8	30-39	110-144
7	40-49	145-169
6	50-59	170-209
5	60-69	210-249
4	70-79	250-299
3	80-89	300-349
2	90-99	350-399
1	100-120	400-500
0	>120	>500

Notes:

- 1: \$ = design + permitting
 2: \$ = construction + construction contingency + construction administration/observation

[Section IIA continued below]

6. **Habitat and/or ecological uplift** (Max. 10 points)

Option 1: Estimate habitat uplift by calculating sediment load transport reduction [in pounds per LF restored per year]. Use a CWMTF approved sediment load estimation method to calculate load as described the Restoration Guidelines document and then see table below.

<i>SEDIMENT REDUCTION</i>	
<u>Score</u>	<u>(lb/LF/Yr)</u>
10	>500
9	450-500
8	400-459
7	350-399
6	300-349
5	250-299
4	200-249
3	150-199
2	100-149
1	10-99
0	<10

Option 2: Estimate habitat uplift by determining the percentage of project length or area that is predicted to receive significant habitat improvement. Use a CWMTF approved assessment to determine existing habitat conditions as described in the Restoration Guidelines Document to determine the percent of the existing project that does not contain functioning habitat and the percentage that contains habitat of limited function.

Completed field assessment forms from the North Carolina Stream Assessment Method (NC SAM*), the North Carolina Wetland Assessment Method (NC WAM*) or the Stream Quantification Tool (SQT) should be attached to the project application in order to receive points using Option 2.

Points will then be determined by CWMTF staff based on the general function:

$$\text{Habitat uplift score} = (\% \text{ project that will raise non-function habitat to functioning}) * 10 \\ + (\% \text{ project that will poorly functioning to functioning}) * 5$$

*These stream and wetland assessment methods are endorsed by NCDEQ and USACE

[Section II continued below]

B. Consistency with DWR Basinwide Plan, NC Division of Mitigation Services (formerly EEP), CWMTF other surface water State Agency plans (Max. 5 points)

1. Project site work explicitly mentioned as needed (5 points)
2. Project type mentioned as beneficial to pristine or nutrient sensitive waters (4 points)
3. Generally supports goals of the Basinwide Plan or other surface water State Agency Plan (2 points) 4.
No connection to surface water State Agency Plan (0 points)

[Rating System continued below]

Section III. Other Public Benefits (0-10 points)

A. Recreational Uses and Public Access (2 points)

1. Improves recreational use related to water (e.g. fishing, boating). Must have public access.

B. Provides Public or Scientific Education (Max. 2 points)

1. Part of an organized educational effort open to public or educational institutions. This effort would include active promotion by outreach, which could include a presence on the internet (e.g. a website) and also signage, etc. at the project site. (2 points)
2. No educational component (0 points)

C. Development of Riparian Greenway (Max. 2 points)

1. Will establish a greenway system or add to an existing greenway as part of this project. (2 points)
2. No greenway to be developed (0 points)

D. Location Relative to Existing and Future Public Drinking Water Supply (Max. 4 points)

1. Existing surface drinking water supply (reservoir or intake), within 5 miles downstream. (4 points)
2. Future surface water supply that has received Record of Decision (reservoir or intake), within 5 miles downstream (3 points)
3. Future surface drinking water supply (reservoir or intake) within 5 miles downstream has Division of Water Resources concurrence (2 points)

Section IV. Readiness at the date of the project application (0-10 points)

A. Landowner Interest (Max. 4 points) *[Note: In order to be eligible for consideration for CWMTF funding, all of the landowners must be contacted and at least have indicated willingness to agree to a conservation easement prior to submittal of the grant application.]*

1. Majority of landowners have signed a conservation agreement. (4 points)
2. Majority of landowners have provided a letter of intent to sign a conservation agreement. (2 points).
3. All landowners have been contacted and some or all have verbally agreed to sign a conservation agreement. (0 points)

B. Funding Status (Max. 3 points)

Status of match resources (e.g., matching funds, personnel, services, equipment, access to land) needed to implement the project:

1. Portion of the proposed matching resources that are already available and committed to the project: Points
Score = % Committed x 0.03

C. Plan and Design Status (Max. 3 points)

1. Plans and specifications are ready to begin construction and all required permits have been obtained or permit application submitted. (3 points)
2. An existing conditions survey of the project site has been completed, a reference site has been identified and conceptual plans have been developed. (2 points)
3. An existing conditions survey of the project site has been completed and attached to the application. (1 point)

[Rating System continued below]

Section V. Value (0-20 points)

A. Matching Resources (Max. 20 points) - Matching resources will be given a value based on the percentage and source of match. Any fraction in the final total will be rounded up.

1. Cash, non-profit & private funds, bargain sale and donated easements = % of total x 0.22
2. Federal and local government funds = % of total x 0.18
3. Other State funds = % of total x 0.14

Section V example: In this example, the request is for \$40K from CWMTF with matching resources coming in the form of cash from a land trust and bargain sale from the landowner (\$30K), and from a Federal grant (\$30K):

Match source	Match (%)	Multiplier	Points
1. Cash / non-profit / private funds/ bargain sale / donated easements			
30% x 0.22	6.6		
2. Federal / local government funds	30%	x 0.18	5.4
3. Other State funds	0%	x 0.14	0
Total: 12			